



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/782,227	02/14/2001	Hui-Wen Cheng	EM/CHENG/6536	9687
7590	06/25/2004		EXAMINER	
BACON & THOMAS 4th Floor 625 Slaters Lane Alexandria, VA 22314			KALINOWSKI, ALEXANDER G	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3626	

DATE MAILED: 06/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/782,227	CHENG, HUI-WEN
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Alexander Kalinowski	3626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 February 2001.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-9 are presented for examination.

Priority

2. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in Taiwan on 10/31/2000. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the 89122929 application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The limitation includes the acronym WAP. The claim does not provide any explanation of the meaning of the acronym WAP. For purposes of applying prior art, the Examiner will interpret the acronym WAP to represent Wireless Application Protocol.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The basis of this rejection is set forth in a two-prong test of:

- (1) whether the invention is within the technological arts; and
- (2) whether the invention produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result.

For a claimed invention to be statutory, the claimed invention must be within the technological arts. Mere ideas in the abstract (i.e., abstract idea, law of nature, natural phenomena) that do not apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts fail to promote the "progress of science and the useful arts" (i.e., the physical sciences as opposed to social sciences, for example) and therefore are found to be non-statutory subject matter. For a process claim to pass muster, the recited process must somehow apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts.

In the present case, the instant claims fail to recite the use of any type of technology (e.g. computer system) within the recited steps of the claimed method of tracking vaccination of people. The recited steps constitute an idea on how to create and manage vaccination records of patients.

Mere intended or nominal use of a component, albeit within the technological arts, does not confer statutory subject matter to an otherwise abstract idea if the component does not apply, involve, use, or advance the underlying process.

Additionally, for a claimed invention to be statutory, the claimed invention must produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result. In the present case the claimed method recites steps for creating a managing vaccination records of patients.

Although the claimed invention produces a useful, concrete and tangible result, since the claimed invention as a whole is not within the technological arts, as explained above, claims 1-4 are deemed to be directed to non statutory subject matter

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-3 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by WIC Manual (hereinafter WIC).

As to claims 1 and 6, WIC discloses A method of watching a person to be vaccinated in time comprising the following steps carried out in a computer system (see page 3):

- a) determining time for a person to be vaccinated according to medical criteria on his/her vaccination history recorded in a database of vaccination of persons (pages 2-3);
- b) notifying said person or his/her proxy the determined vaccination time in advance the determined vaccination time (page 3);

- c) reminding said person or his/her proxy of the vaccination if said computer system should fail to receive a confirmation of his/her vaccination after the determined vaccination time (i.e. Immunizations needed flag)(page 3); and
- d) entering vaccination data of said person into the database of vaccination of persons, if said computer system receives the confirmation of his/her vaccination (page 6).

As to claims 2 and 7, WIC discloses The method as claimed in Claim 1, in which said database of vaccination contains data related to Hepatitis B vaccine; Diphtheria, tetanus toxoids and pertussis mixed vaccine; Poliovirus vaccine; or Japanese encephalitis vaccine (pages 7 and 8).

As to claims 3 and 8, WIC discloses The method as claimed in Claim 1, in which said medical criteria in step a) are vaccination timetable recognized by the medical profession (page 3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claim 4, 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WIC and as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, and further in view of the Examiner's use of Official notice.

Art Unit: 3626

As to claim 4, WIC does not explicitly disclose The method as claimed in Claim 1, in which said reminding is once per day.

However, the Examiner takes official notice that it was well known in the electronic calendar arts to provide daily reminders. The motivation was to remind the user of critical events or tasks to be performed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include the aforementioned limitation for the motivation stated above.

As to claim 5 and 9, WIC does not explicitly disclose The method as claimed in Claim 1, in which said notifying or said reminding step adopt a WAP system.

However, the Examiner takes official notice that it was well known in the communication arts to transmit over WAP system. The motivation was to transmit and receive data from handheld data processing devices (i.e. phones or PDA's). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include the aforementioned limitation for the motivation stated above.

Double Patenting

10. Claims 1-9 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of copending Application No. 09/782,000. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims in the '000 application are similar in scope to the claims in the instant application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
 - a. Pub. No. 2002/0042846 discloses a system of automating transmission of notification messages.
 - b. "State revising immunization database rules" discloses an immunization registry database.
 - c. "Health panel hopes to help kids get shots" discloses a statewide immunization database.
12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexander Kalinowski, whose telephone number is (703) 305-2398. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 9:00 AM to 6:30 PM. In addition, the examiner can be reached on alternate Fridays.

Art Unit: 3626

If any attempt to reached the examiner by telephone is unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas, can be reached on (703) 305-9588. The fax telephone number for this group is (703) 305-7687 (for official communications including After Final communications labeled "Box AF").

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, 7th Floor, receptionist.



Alexander Kalinowski

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3626

6/21/2004